



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/394,968	09/10/1999	PHILLIP LEE SCANLAN	2001.2.4	5208

21552 7590 04/25/2002

MADSON & METCALF
GATEWAY TOWER WEST
SUITE 900
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER

EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/394,968

Applicant(s)
SCANLAN

Examiner
PATRICK N. EDOUARD

Art Unit
2654



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 18, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2644

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filed 1/18/02 (paper #5) . Claims 1-19 and new claims 20-22 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitations “determining if a human translation of the communication to the native language may be required by the recipient” is vague and indefinite because it does not define the metes and bounds of the claims. This limitation “may be” has been used throughout the claims and render them vague and indefinite.

Art Unit: 2644

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application No 10124516 ("JP516") in view of Church (5,608,622).

JP516 teaches a method for automatically processing of electronic communication including the steps of

"sending a communication from a sender in a first language"; (a mail translation managing part 3... and manages the translation processing of the electronic mail)" identifying the communication as a foreign language" (a mail translation managing part 3... and manages the translation processing of the electronic mail); " determining if a translation of the communication to a native language is required by the recipient" (a mail translation managing part 3... judges whether or not the reception ... and manages the translation processing of the electronic mail); applying a translation program to the communication to generate a machine translation if a translation...by a recipient" a translating processing part 4 receives the mail...translation managing part 4).

It is noted that JP516 teaches the claimed invention bu does not explicitly teach determining if a human translation of the communication to the native language may be required

Art Unit: 2644

by the recipient” . However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Church who teaches at col. 5, lines 1-30, when the translation received a job from a client, it enters information about the job, then analyses the document to be translated and gives the customer a price. Also , If the client decides to go ahead with the translation, the document id transferred to a human translator to have the document translate. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate into the translation processing system of JP156 a translation system using a human operator as taught by Church because it would provide to users the ability to request a translation using either a machine translation or a human translator that would make the system more versatile and more attractive to be used.

Church further teaches “applying a quotation program to the communication...” (col. 5, lines 1-5) and forwarding the communication...to the recipient (the combination of the machine translation and the human translator that are used to translate the document (mail)).

As per claim 2, JP516, the recipient formulating a response to the communication (the recipient will respond to the mail);

“Identifying the response as a native language response..communication” (the mail system could be used to determine if the recipient response needed be translated into the sender language”;

“If required by the sender applying a machine translation program to the native language... forwarding the foreign language” (the sender can request the recipient response be translated to his native language”

Art Unit: 2644

As per claim 3, the combination teaches “ further including the step of ...foreign language” (the combination teaches that the translation could be done using the translation machine of JP516 or the translator of Church).

As per claims 4-6 JP516 teaches wherein the sender directs communication to an email address (a mail translation managing part...);

As per claims 7-10, Church teaches said quotation are sent to the recipient by email (col. 5, lines 1+)

As per claims 11-12, JP516 teaches wherein the step of identifying the communication as a foreign language communication.. (a mail translation managing part 3...).

Claims 13-22 are the same in scope and content as claims 1-12 above and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2644

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,

Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W. Isen, can be reached on (703) 305-4386.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 872-9314. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's voice mailbox

Serial Number: 09/394,968

Page 7


Art Unit: 2644

(telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

April 18, 2002



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PATENT EXAMINER